

equally different. Finally, even if the Egyptologists could by some unknown necromancy succeed in translating the ancient inscriptions, it was evident that any statement made in such unscrupulous flatteries and self-laudations as the monuments were supposed to contain, could be of no historic importance whatever. No statement on the obelisks could be believed unless it were confirmed by written history, and the so-called "results" in the lists of names of unknown kings were of no more value historically than "an authentic account of the succession of a breed of crocodiles or hippopotami in the Nile, or of a series of sacred apes in a temple. This was severe; yet as we look back upon the extravagant claims of the students of Egyptian history twenty-five or thirty years ago we must confess that a severe criticism of some kind was needed. Baron Bunsen, for example, the friend of Champollion, and ardent champion of the new learning, had in his "Egypt's Place in Universal History," and elsewhere, drawn out conclusions and spun theories from facts discovered, or which he expected would be discovered from the ancient records, for which no justification can be made. He could not only prove to a demonstration that Israel had been in Egypt 1,000 years, but could tell just how many millenniums it was before the Deluge that Menes entered Egypt, and he even had the courage to calculate the birth year of Adam—B. C. 19,752!

Following close upon the sober criticism of Sir Cornewall Lewis, other less judicious criticisms appeared. Among these was a bitter little pamphlet by Johannes Von Gumpach, who made a personal attack upon Lepsius. Lepsius had been a worthy follower of Champollion. He had criticised his processes and revised his results. With his flowing beard, his red turban and long white garments, he looked the very embodiment of Egyptian learning, as in 1842 he entered the valley of the Nile at the head of the scientific expedition organized by Frederick William IV. of Prussia, on the recommendation of Eichhorn, Alexander von Humboldt and Bunsen. There he had spent years in exploration, and had finally published his "*Deukmaelen*," a sumptuous work rivaling that of Napoleon, through which scholars were brought into contact not only with the ruins of Egypt, where statues lay like fallen mountains, but with its scenery, its very atmosphere, and above all with exact copies of its ancient monuments.

It was this man whom Von Gumpach ridiculed, comparing his efforts in the field of Egyptian literature to that of an Englishman who being "just able to make out a word of German here and there and without either a grammar or dictionary at his command should undertake to compose a German inscription for some public building in London, or to publish a critical edition of the works of Goethe!" These fault finders were not long left unanswered.

Both R. S. Poole and LePage Renouf, elaborately replied to Sir